

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 24 and 25 were the only claims pending which the Examiner rejected. These claims have now been cancelled.

In reviewing the claims on file and the response filed to the previous Office Action we have identified a clerical error in each of method claims 21 and 23 where the words “means for” before the expression “determining if a hard handoff from the first radio sector to the second radio sector is desirable for the mobile terminal” should not have appeared. Note the sentence beginning at line of page 11 of the previous response where it is stated that amendment to claims 21 and 23 involved the operation of “determining if a hard handoff from the first radio sector to the second radio sector is desirable for the mobile terminal”.

Thus, the clear intention was that this should recite a method step rather than a “means plus function” limitation which is not appropriate in a method claim.


Although the Examiner did not object to claims 21 and 23 it is submitted that the minor amendment submitted clarifies the claims and should be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, early favorable consideration of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

RISVAN COSKUN ET AL

By

  
James McGraw  
Reg. No. 28,168

Date: December 8, 2004

JMc/wfs